



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/531,917	03/21/2000	Andrew Sharp	P11547(34648-00440USPX)	7310
27045	7590	06/08/2004	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC. 6300 LEGACY DRIVE M/S EVR C11 PLANO, TX 75024			TRAN, PABLO N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2685	

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

for

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/531,917

Applicant(s)

SHARP ET AL.

Examiner

Pablo N Tran

Art Unit

2685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/27/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant's stated that "Tornqvist does not allow multiple call capability or additional in parallel". In response to the Applicant, Tornqvist teach such method of setting up additional call in parallel (see col. 111/ln. 14-col. 114/ln. 35).

The Applicant's stated that "Hietalahti does not describe parallel or multi-call capability". In response to the Applicant, Hietalahti teach such method of parallel or multi-call capability (see fig. 1/no. 13, fig. 2/no. 22, pg. 11/ln. 8-26).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2685

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Tornqvist et al.* (6,055,424).

As per claims 1, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed a method of providing services to a mobile terminal in a mobile communication system wherein requesting a set-up of an additional call while the number of n active calls with m different bearer capabilities associated thereto is already set up; and deciding whether to set up the additional call in parallel, to set up the additional call by choosing one call to put on hold, or to reject a set up of the additional call (col. 18/ln. 18-21, col. 111/ln. 14-18, col. 113/ln. 11-14, col. 113/ln. 54-57, col. 114/ln. 12-13, col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 2, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 2 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

Art Unit: 2685

As per claim 3, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 3 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 4, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 4 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claims 5 and 18, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 5 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 6, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 6 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 7, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 7 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 8, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 8 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claims 9 and 20, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 9 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claims 10 and 21, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 10 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claims 11 and 22, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 11 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 12, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 12 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 13, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 13 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

Art Unit: 2685

As per claim 14, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 14 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claims 15-16 and 24-25, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed a mobile communication system comprises a comparator for comparing a bearer capability associated with a requested call set up with m bearer capabilities of the n active calls; a first unit to decide whether the request call set up should be offered as a new parallel call, as a waiting call, or a rejected call; and a storage to store information about the active calls (col. 18/ln. 18-21, col. 111/ln. 14-18, col. 113/ln. 11-14, col. 113/ln. 54-57, col. 114/ln. 12-13, col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 17, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 17 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 19, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 19 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

As per claim 23, *Tornqvist et al.* disclosed the limitation of claim 23 (col. 28/ln. 35-col. 29/ln. 58).

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *Hietalahti* (WO9608937).

Art Unit: 2685

As per claim 1, *Hietalahti* disclosed a method of providing services in a mobile communication system wherein requesting a set-up of an additional call while the number of  $n$  active calls with  $m$  different bearer capabilities associated thereto is already set up; and deciding whether to set up the additional call in parallel, to set up the additional call by choosing one call to put on hold, or to reject a set up of the additional call (fig. 1-2, pg. 4/ln. 15-pg. 5/ln. 5).

### Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Young et al. (6,324,405), Chatterjee et al. (6,188,899), Lopez-Torres (6,144,647), Ginter (5,579,375, and Norimatsu (5,438,612) disclose implementation of multi-calls in a radiotelephone communication system.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pablo Tran whose telephone number is (703)308-7941. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached at (703)305-4385.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

Art Unit: 2685

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

**PABLO N. TRAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

June 1, 2004

  
